

REMARKS

## OVERVIEW

Claims 8-13 and 15-16 are pending in this application. The present response is in earnest effort to place all claims in proper form for immediate allowance.

## ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riddel et al (U.S. 3,574,930) in view of Rosen et al (U.S. 6,099,164).

Claim 8 requires "depositing the mixture of metal film materials on a substrate using a thin film process." Riddel does not disclose the step of "depositing" or using a "thin film process." The Office Action indicates in numbered paragraph 2 that "A printing process is a thin film process because each layer is thin and deposited independently of each other." Further, the Office Action indicates that Riddel discloses "using a thin film process."

Riddle discloses that "[t]he thermistor material is applied to the nickel substrate by means of printing with a silk screen as is common practice in the art." (Col. 2, lines 69-71). A "thermistor ink" is used (col. 2, line 71). This film is simply not applied through a "thin film process" as understood by those skilled in the art.

Attached as Exhibit A are exemplary examples of references obtained via an Internet search that differentiate between "thin film" and thick film" and "thin film processes" and "thick film processes." These references make clear that these are two separate and distinct processes. The screen printing of thick films and of the Riddle reference simply cannot be considered to be a depositing step of a thin film process. Therefore, to consider the Riddle reference to disclose "depositing" using a "thin film process" is simply in error. Therefore this rejection should be withdrawn on that basis.

The Office Action also indicates that the Rosen discloses selecting a negative temperature coefficient of resistance versus temperature curve and associating the curve to the thermistor (numbered paragraph 2, referring to Figures 8 and 9 of Rosen). Figures 8 and 9 of Rosen are plots of the log of resistance of crystals versus reciprocal temperature. (Col. 5, lines 1-6; Col. 19, lines 26-32). Claim 8, however, requires "selecting a mixture of metal film materials to provide the negative temperature coefficient of resistance versus temperature curve while maintaining a desired physical size for the thermistor." This step is not disclosed in Rosen. In particular, Rosen does not disclose or teach the need for a particular size of thermistor or how different mixtures of metal film materials are selected "to provide the negative temperature coefficient of resistance versus temperature curve while maintaining a desired physical size." Therefore, claim 8 is significantly different from either Riddle and Rosen, and the combination of Riddle and Rosen. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn and the Examiner should find claim 8 allowable. As claims 9-13 and 15 depend from claim 8, these claims should also be allowed.

Claim 16 requires "selecting a mixture of metal film materials to provide desired negative temperature coefficient of resistance properties while maintaining a standardized physical size and depositing the metal film materials on a substrate using a thin film process." This limitation is not disclosed in either reference. One advantage of the present invention is that it allows package sizes to be standardized independent of particular negative temperature coefficient of resistance properties, because the mixture, of metal films are appropriately selected to provide the desired negative temperature coefficient of resistance properties. Neither reference teaches or discloses this advantage over the prior art. Neither Riddel nor Rosen recognize or appreciate the problem, let alone the solution provided by the claimed invention.

The combination of Riddel and Rosen also fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, Riddel discloses a thermistor assembly (that has a size), Rosen discloses a negative temperature coefficient of resistance graph associated with a thermistor. This combination does not provide that a "mixture of metal film materials" is selected to "provide desired negative temperatures coefficient of resistance properties" while maintaining a standardized physical size." Neither reference discloses standardized physical sizes or providing NTC resistors of various NTC of resistance properties in the same size package by "selecting a mixture of metal film materials" to provide the desired properties. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn as well.


#### SUMMARY

Based upon the foregoing, the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn and all claims should be allowed.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,





JOHN D. GOODHUE, Reg. No. 47,603  
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.  
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721  
Phone No. (515) 288-3667  
Fax No. (515) 288-1338  
**CUSTOMER NO: 22885**  
Attorneys of Record

- bja -